

Report on the proposed conservation of the family-group name BELEMNITIDAE d'Orbigny, 1845 (Mollusca, Coleoidea), with suppression of the generic name *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 and the designation of *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915 as the type genus

(Case 2571; see BZN 43: 355–359; 44: 48, 194; 45: 50)

P. K. Tubbs

Executive Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

The proposals in this case by P. Doyle and W. Riegraf were published in December 1986 and March 1987, and on 1 December 1988 the Commission was asked to vote on them. The voting papers included '*Notes relating to the case*', which are reproduced below. The members of the Commission voted 20:3 in support of the proposals, but in dissenting Dr W. D. L. Ride asked that the case be re-opened, although he raised no unpublished issue.

The '*Notes*' on the voting papers and the following '*Request for comments*' were sent to all those who had corresponded on the case, and their edited replies are now published. Further comments are invited before the Commission re-votes on the proposals of Doyle and Riegraf.

Notes relating to the case, as sent to members of the Commission in December 1988

Since publication of the original application, a supplementary proposal for the conservation of the family name BELEMNITIDAE d'Orbigny, 1845 was made by the authors and published in BZN 44: 48 (March 1987).

A comment in support of the original application received from Mr C. W. Wright (*Beaminster, Dorset, U.K.*) was published in BZN 44: 48, together with a reply and the supplementary proposal by the authors.

Comments in support of both the original and supplementary proposals received from Professor D. T. Donovan (*University College, London, U.K.*) and from Dr M. K. Howarth (*British Museum (Natural History), London, U.K.*) were published in BZN 44: 194 and 45: 50. Dr T. I. Nal'nyaeva (*Institute of Geology and Geophysics, Novosibirsk, USSR*) also supported the suppression of *Belemnites paxillosa* (BZN 45: 50).

A comment in opposition from Professor G. Hahn was published in BZN 45: 50. The published comments by Donovan, Howarth and Nal'nyaeva are directly relevant to Professor Hahn's reservation. Further comments have been received from Mr R. V. Melville, Professor C. H. Holland (*Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland*), and Mr B. Challinor (*Hamilton, New Zealand*), who all agree that the name *Belemnites paxillosa* cannot be defined by a type designation, but that conservation of the name BELEMNITIDAE (with *Passaloteuthis* as type genus) is most important.

The proposals in BZN 43: 357 and 44: 48 are consolidated below, with unchanged content.

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

- (1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 and also the specific name *paxillosa* Lamarck, 1801, as published in the binomen *Belemnites paxillosa*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

- (2) to use its plenary powers to designate *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915 as the type genus of the nominal family BELEMNITIDAE d'Orbigny, 1845;
- (3) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation *Belemnites bruguierianus* d'Orbigny, 1843 (name of the type genus of BELEMNITIDAE d'Orbigny, 1845 by designation in (2) above);
- (4) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *bruguierianus* d'Orbigny, 1843, as published in the binomen *Belemnites bruguierianus* (specific name of the type species of *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915);
- (5) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology the name BELEMNITIDAE d'Orbigny, 1845 (type genus *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915 by designation in (2) above);
- (6) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the name *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799, as suppressed in (1) above;
- (7) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the name *paxillosa* Lamarck, 1801, as published in the binomen *Belemnites paxillosa* and as suppressed in (1) above.

Request for comments, sent to correspondents in March 1989

The above proposals were submitted to the Commission in 1986 by P. Doyle and W. Riegraf, and were supported by a number of workers. The application, the published comments, and notes on the voting papers which were distributed to members of the Commission on 1 December 1988 are attached.

In unpublished comments (mentioned on the voting papers) Mr R. V. Melville wrote 'I heartily support the proposals of Doyle & Riegraf...', Prof C. H. Holland wrote '... as to the problem of BELEMNITIDAE, I agree with Doyle & Riegraf about this', and Mr B. Challinor said 'I strongly support the proposal to suppress the names *Belemnites* and *paxillosa* of Lamarck but to retain the family name BELEMNITIDAE'.

The proposals, which were published in BZN 43: 357 and 44: 48 and repeated on the voting papers, were presented to the Commission for a 3-month vote in December 1988. They were accepted by 20 Commissioners and rejected by 3, as follows:

For: Bayer, Bock, Cocks, Cogger, Corliss, Dupuis [abstaining in part, but supporting proposals (2) and (5)], Hahn, Heppell, Holthuis, Kabata, Kraus, Martins de Souza, Melville, Mroczkowski, Nielsen, Savage, Schuster, Thompson, Uéno, Willink.
Against: Ride, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin.

Voting for, Prof Hahn withdrew his earlier objection [BZN 45: 50], stating 'I now agree to the proposals, since (1) the name BELEMNITIDAE is conserved and (2) specialists have shown that the selection of a neotype of *Belemnites paxillosa* is not possible'.

Voting against, Dr Starobogatov said 'If we conserve the names BELEMNITIDAE and BELEMNITIDA we should conserve the name *Belemnites*, or in future great confusion could be caused if many families had names different from the type genera. Perhaps it is simpler to designate a neotype'.

Of the other two Commissioners voting against, Dr Trjapitzin made no comment, but with his vote Dr Ride wrote 'The conclusion to secure BELEMNITIDAE and to base it on the taxonomic concept expressed in the nominal taxon *Passaloteuthis* seems perfectly desirable but the solution to that end could be most upsetting. It is fundamental

in the nomenclature of the family-group that the type of any name in the family-group is determined by the root of the name (Art. 63). The same result can be achieved in a manner less upsetting to nomenclature by (1) setting aside all fixations of type species for *Belemnites* Lamarck, and (2) by declaring it a junior objective synonym of *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous by the relative precedence procedure. *B. bruguierianus* would become its type. Under Art. 40 BELEMNITIDAE as a taxonomic concept would be interpreted by reference to the taxonomic concept expressed equally by *Passaloteuthis* and *Belemnites*. Please re-open the case, as I consider that the action that the Commission is being asked to take under Art. 79 is contrary to a fundamental principle of the Code and would be seriously upsetting if adopted'.

Because Dr Ride asked that this case be referred back to the Commission I am sending this material to you for your comments. Your advice would be very much appreciated, so that the Commission can be fully informed when it votes again on this issue.

Dr Ride has proposed that, using its plenary powers, the Commission should (1) designate *B. bruguierianus* [the type species of *Passaloteuthis*] as the type species of *Belemnites* and then (2) rule that *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 (as re-defined) is to be treated as a junior objective synonym of *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915. The object of this is to keep the name *Belemnites* available for the nominal type genus of BELEMNITIDAE, though for no other purpose (the valid name for the genus would be *Passaloteuthis*). This would avoid departing from Articles 29 and 63 (eponymous families and type genera) and from zoological tradition, and so setting an undesirable precedent.

The alternative view is (1) that specialists have stated that *any* re-introduction of *Belemnites* as a generic name, even (or possibly especially) for a purely formal purpose and without its original date priority, would be very confusing to palaeontologists, (2) that all the information has been published and been supported, (3) that no general precedent would be set, since the designation of *Passaloteuthis* as the type genus of BELEMNITIDAE is an explicit act of the Commission using its plenary powers in an individual and special case, and there is no 'case law' in zoological nomenclature (page xiv of the Code, para. 8).

Since the Commission will now be asked to vote again on this case, your views would be much appreciated: should *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 have *B. bruguierianus* designated as its type species and then be treated as a junior objective synonym of *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915, or should *Belemnites* be suppressed and *Passaloteuthis* be designated as the type genus of BELEMNITIDAE, as previously voted upon?

Replies received

(1) P. Doyle

Nature Conservancy Council, Northminster House, Peterborough PE1 1UA, U.K.

Thank you for the papers summarising the progress of our proposed suppression of the generic name *Belemnites*, with conservation of the family name BELEMNITIDAE. I note Dr Ride's alternative suggestion, but it is my view that the original course suggested by Dr Riegraf and myself is the more sensible option.

The designation of *bruguierianus* d'Orbigny, 1843 as type species of *Belemnites* would not solve the problem painlessly, as though *Belemnites* and *Passaloteuthis* would be thus objective synonyms, their priority would be inverted. For clarification, future taxonomists concerned with the group would have to refer to two rulings of the Commission; namely the initial reason for the designation of *bruguierianus* as type, and secondly, the explanation why *Belemnites* is not then a senior objective synonym of *Passaloteuthis*. In my view, this is a tortuous alternative to the designation of *Passaloteuthis* as type genus of the BELEMNITIDAE.

It is my view that:

1. The Commission should reject the retention of *Belemnites*, in any form, for the reasons already published in the Bulletin, and should not accept Dr Ride's suggestion, which would ultimately be more confusing to future systematists than the original proposal.
2. The Commission should accept the designation of *Passaloteuthis* as type genus of the BELEMNITIDAE, as summarised in BZN 44: 48.

Finally, with regard to the current status of the nominal species *Belemnites bruguierianus*:

- (a) A specimen of the type series (i.e. a syntype) exists in the British Museum (Natural History), and Dr Goutier of the Paris Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle is proposing to formally select this as lectotype;
- (b) The present state of knowledge is that *Belemnites bruguierianus* is a junior subjective synonym of *B. bisulcatus* Blainville, 1827 (p. 79 of his *Mémoire sur les Bélemnites considérées zoologiquement et géologiquement*).

I hope this clarifies the position.

(2) Wolfgang Riegraf

c/o Westfälisches Museum für Naturkunde, Sentruper Strasse 285, D-440 Münster 1, Fed. Rep. Germany

There is no other possibility to stabilize the zoological nomenclature than to suppress the generic name *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 in favour of *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915 (type *Belemnites bruguierianus* d'Orbigny, 1843).

Any synonymization of *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 (a nomen dubium) with *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915 (as subjective or objective synonym) would cause further confusion. Also, *Belemnites* cannot be defined by selection of a neotype for its type species, as confirmed by specialists (see cited references in the Bulletin).

I strongly emphasise that the family name BELEMNITIDAE should remain valid.

(3) Gerhard Hahn

Berliner Strasse 31, D-3576 Rauschenberg, Fed. Rep. Germany

Thank you very much for the information concerning the suppression of *Belemnites*. I strongly support the proposal of Dr Ride, and I am happy that it may be perhaps a way to conserve the name *Belemnites*. As you know, I never was happy with the suppression of that name, but I voted in the affirmative, because it seems to be impossible to select a neotype, as was shown by the comments of the specialists. The proposal of Dr Ride avoids this difficulty.

(4) C. H. Holland

Department of Geology, Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland

Thank you for the material concerning *Belemnites*. There is no point in going over the same ground. I simply find the proposal by Dr Ride, though no doubt procedurally in order, to promise much future confusion for practising taxonomists. I think matters should be left as they have been decided. It is a very satisfactory decision supported by various people concerned with the cephalopods. I can see no difficulty in maintaining the family name BELEMNITIDAE in spite of the lack of the root. Everybody knows where the root originally was. Finally there is no question of this creating a widespread practice. This particular situation has its unique character.

(5) C. W. Wright

The Old Rectory, Seaborough, Beaminster, Dorset DT8 3QY, U.K.

Dr Ride says that a plenary powers decision to conserve BELEMNITIDAE while suppressing *Belemnites* would be 'seriously upsetting', because it would transgress the principle of having family names based on a currently available generic name. But *all* plenary powers decisions transgress some principle — in the interests of stability. It would be just as 'seriously upsetting' to declare that *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 (redefined) was a 'junior' objective synonym of *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915. In fact, it would be *more* upsetting, since the Principle of Priority is the most fundamental principle of the Code.

(6) D. T. Donovan

Department of Geological Sciences, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, U.K.

I believe that the most straightforward thing would be to accept the majority vote of the Commission and suppress the generic name *Belemnites* for all purposes, retaining the name BELEMNITIDAE as a family-group name.

The alternative, proposed by Dr Ride, to retain *Belemnites* with a new type species, but declare it a junior objective synonym, would seem a rather tortuous procedure, and also confusing in making a very old name a junior synonym!

However, it must be admitted that it would not make a great deal of difference to systematic authors which solution is adopted, as in either case they would wish to refer to the name *Belemnites* and explain what had happened to it, once a decision of the Commission is available.

(7) A. B. Challinor

25 Bailey Avenue, Hamilton, New Zealand

Thank you for the opportunity to comment further on the *Belemnites* problem. I have read through comments by the Commissioners and others and still consider the majority opinion to be the most practical. As before, I favour suppression of the names *Belemnites* and *paxillosa* Lamarck, and designation of *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915 as type genus of BELEMNITIDAE.

(8) M. K. Howarth

Department of Palaeontology, British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

If the Commission is going to vote again on this case, I would not support the designation of *B. bruguierianus* as type species of *Belemnites* as a device to secure *Belemnites* rather than *Passaloteuthis* as the type genus of BELEMNITIDAE. The proposals as originally proposed, voted on and accepted, i.e. to suppress *Belemnites* and to designate *Passaloteuthis* as type genus of BELEMNITIDAE, seem to me to resolve the difficulty in the best way that is possible. After all the discussion about the difficulty in interpreting *Belemnites* and its type species, I think that to use the plenary powers to designate a different type species would cause more confusion in the long term than is desirable. I can only support the outcome of the case as originally voted on.

Comments on the proposed precedence of GRYLLACRIDOIDEA Stål, 1874 (Insecta, Orthoptera) over STENOPELMATOIDEA Burmeister, 1838
(Case 2603; see BZN 46: 25–27 and 191)

(1) D. C. F. Rentz

Division of Entomology, CSIRO Australia, GPO Box 1700, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia

I would like to support Key's proposal to give the name GRYLLACRIDOIDEA precedence over the older name STENOPELMATOIDEA. As he points out, many revisions, faunal works, and general textbooks have used the term GRYLLACRIDOIDEA for more than 40 years for the group concerned. It would serve no useful purpose that I can see to replace the name. I urge the Commission to use its powers to conserve it for the superfamily that contains, among others, *Stenopelmatus* Burmeister, 1838 and *Gryllacris* Audinet-Serville, 1831.

(2) Miss A. J. A. Green (*Tasmanian Museum, GPO Box 1164M, Hobart, Tasmania 7001, Australia*) and Dr N. D. Jago (*Overseas Development Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, Kent ME4 4TB, U.K.*) have also written in support of the proposals in BZN 46: 26–27.